

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5 and 7-10 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 9 and 10 being independent.

The abstract has been replaced to better set forth the technical features of the claimed invention.

Independent Claims 1, 9 and 10, have been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art.

The amendments to the claims were not presented earlier as it was believed that the previously presented claims would be found allowable. This Amendment does not add any additional claims. Moreover, the Examiner's familiarity with the subject matter of the present application will allow an appreciation of the significance of the amendments herein without undue expenditure of time and effort. Finally, the Amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search. Accordingly, it is submitted that consideration and entry of the Amendment is appropriate.

Initially, the previous Amendment of August 13, 2007, was objected to for allegedly adding new matter into the abstract. In response, the terms "enlargement/reduction ratio" and "reduction ratio" have been removed from the new abstract. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is thus deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response to this

rejection, the terms “enlargement/reduction ratio” and “reduction ratio” have been removed from the claims. It is submitted, therefore, that all of the claims are now in full compliance with the written description requirement of the statute. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Horiuchi ‘741. In addition, Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Horiuchi in view of Tanaka ‘336. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicant’s invention relates to a document display method comprising a determination step of determining, in a case that a display magnification of document data to be displayed is reduced, whether or not the display magnification of the document data is equal to or greater than a predetermined display magnification, and an applying step of applying smoothing processing to image data of the document data if it is determined that the display magnification of the document is equal to or greater than the predetermined display magnification. The smoothing processing is not applied to the image data if it is determined that the display magnification of the document data is less than a predetermined display magnification. In addition, a display step displays the image data to which the smoothing processing has been applied or the image data to which the smoothing processing has not been applied.

Claims 9 and 10 relate to a document display apparatus and a computer-readable recording medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 1. These claims have thus also been amended and now determine whether or not the display magnification of document

data is equal to or greater than a predetermined display magnification, in a case that a display magnification of document data to be displayed is reduced.

The Horiuchi patent relates to an image processing apparatus that includes a smoothing unit for smoothing input image data. With reference to Figure 5, the image processing apparatus includes a controller 119, a smoothing unit 114 and an enlargement/reduction ratio setting unit 117.

In contrast to Applicant's invention, however, Horiuchi does not teach or suggest, among other features, determining whether or not the display magnification of the document data is equal to or greater than a predetermined display magnification in a case that a display magnification of document data to be displayed is reduced. Horiuchi thus also fails to apply a smoothing processing to image data of the document data based on such a determination. In Horiuchi, the smoothing process is performed to image data that is enlarged (see, for example, column 6, lines 7-23).

Accordingly, it is submitted that Horiuchi fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as set forth in the independent claims, and therefore reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Tanaka relates to an image processing apparatus and is relied upon for its teaching of image data containing character images. Tanaka fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Horiuchi as discussed above with respect to Applicant's independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 9 and 10 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 5, 7 and 8 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vnm

FCBS_WS 1790367v1